

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were originally filed in the Application on April 12, 2004. A Preliminary Amendment that accompanied the Application cancelled original claims 1-21, and added new claims 22-52. All of claims 22-52 were rejected in the Office action mailed August 22, 2005, to which Applicants filed a response on November 17, 2005. Claims 22-26, 29-34, 36-41, 44-49 and 52 stand rejected, and claims 27, 28, 35, 42, 43, 50 and 51 are objected to in the Office action of February 9, 2006. Claims 26, 27, 35, 42 and 50 are cancelled and new claims 53-77 are added by this amendment. Claims 22, 30, 37, 45, 53, 59, 66 and 72 are independent claims. Claims 23-29, 31-36, 38-44, 46-52, 54-58, 60-65, 67-71 and 73-77 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 22, 30, 37, 45, 53, 59, 66 and 72, respectively. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 22-52, and consideration of new claims 53-77, in light of the follow remarks.

Amendments to the Specification

The section titled "CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS" has been amended to update the status of the listed applications, as requested in the Office action (Office action, item 1, page 2), and to add a listing of related U.S. patent applications. The Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments do not add new matter.

The text of the specification has been amended to include a copy of the text of page 122 of United States Patent Application Ser. No. 10/141,506 filed May 8, 2002, (Attorney Docket Nos. 14364US01 and DN37998XGB) (the "'506 application"), which was unintentionally omitted from the Application at the time of filing. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that the omitted page 122 was constructively present in the Application at the time of filing, in that the complete subject matter of the '506 application was incorporated by reference at the time of filing of the Application. Applicants have attached a copy of the relevant portion of the preliminary amendment that accompanied the Application at filing, showing the incorporation by reference of the complete subject matter of the '506 application. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment to insert the omitted page does not add new matter.

Amendments to the Claims

Independent claim 22 has been made allowable, as recognized in the Office action (item 4, page 4), by amending claim 22 to include the limitations of dependent claim 27, and the limitations of intervening dependent claim 26. Claims 26 and 27 have been cancelled. The Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments do not add new matter.

Independent claim 30 has been made allowable, as recognized in the Office action (item 4, page 4), by amending claim 30 to include the limitations of dependent claim 35. Claim 35 has been cancelled. The Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments do not add new matter.

Independent claim 37 has been made allowable, as recognized in the Office action (item 4, page 4), by amending claim 37 to include the limitations of dependent claim 42. Claim 42 has been cancelled. The Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments do not add new matter.

Independent claim 45 has been made allowable, as recognized in the Office action (item 4, page 4), by amending claim 45 to include the limitations of dependent claim 50. Claim 50 has been cancelled. The Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments do not add new matter.

Claim Objections

Claims 27-28, 35, 42-43 and 50-51 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were stated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Base claims 22, 30, 37 and 45 have been amended to include, respectively, all of the limitations of claims 27, 35, 42 and 50, and the limitations of any intervening claims, thereby making claims 22, 30, 37 and 45 allowable. Claims 27, 35, 42 and 50 have been cancelled. The Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 27-28, 35, 42-43 and 50-51 be withdrawn.

Rejections of Claims

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 22-26, 29-34, 36-41, 44-49 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McCaslin et al. (U.S. Patent 5,631,900) in view of Matsumoto (U.S. Patent 5,812,944) and Kline et al. (U.S. Patent 6,157,653). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, in an effort to move the Application to issuance, Applicants have amended claims 22, 30, 37 and 45 as set forth above.

Applicants believe that claims 22, 30, 37 and 45, amended as set forth above, are allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 23-26 and 29, claims 31-34 and 36, claims 38-41 and 44, and claims 46-49 and 52 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 22, 30, 37 and 45, respectively. Because claims 23-26 and 29, claims 31-34 and 36, claims 38-41 and 44, and claims 46-49 and 52 depend, respectively, from allowable claims 22, 30, 37 and 45, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 23-26 and 29, claims 31-34 and 36, claims 38-41 and 44, and claims 46-49 and 52 are allowable, as well. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 22-26, 29-34, 36-41 and 44-49 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), be withdrawn.

Newly Added Claims

Applicants have added new claims 53-77. Claims 53, 59, 66 and 72 are independent claims from which claims 54-58, 60-65, 67-71 and 73-77, respectively, depend either directly or indirectly. Independent claim 53 corresponds to objected to dependent claim 28 rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of base claim 22 and any intervening claims. Independent claim 59 corresponds to objected to dependent claim 28 rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of base claim 30. Independent claim 66 corresponds to objected to dependent claim 43 rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of base claim 37 and any intervening claims. Independent claim 72 corresponds to objected to dependent claim 51 rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of base claim 37 and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 53, 66 and 72 were deemed allowable by the Office action. (Office action, item 4, page 4) Applicants believe that new claim 59 is allowable

for the same reasons. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 54-58, 60-65, 67-71 and 73-77 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 53, 59, 66 and 72, respectively, and are therefore allowable, as well. Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 53-77 do not add new matter.

Conclusion

The Applicants believe that in light of the reasons set forth above, all of claims 22-25, 28-34, 36-41, 43-49 and 51-77 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner disagree or have any questions regarding this submission, the Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned at (312) 775-8000 for an interview.

A Notice of Allowability is courteously solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 9, 2006

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street
Suite 3400
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Phone (312) 775-8000
Facsimile (312) 775-8100

K. E. Borg
Kevin E. Borg
Reg. No. 51,486

eliminate compatibility between devices manufactured by different suppliers. This has hindered development of uniform standards for Electronic Data Interchange between portable devices and fixed computing systems.

5 Physical connection between a portable device with a peripheral or communication dock also hinders user efficiency. Peripheral devices are generally attached with cable. If a peripheral is small enough to be carried or worn on a belt, the mobility of the user may be maintained.

10 If a user must carry a hand-held portable device that is connected to a belt mounted peripheral, the assembly cannot be set down while a task that requires movement to a location several feet away is undertaken unless the portable device and peripheral are disconnected. Likewise,

15 connection to peripherals too large to be portable requires the user to frequently connect and disconnect the device and the peripheral.

 Use of wireless peripheral LAN interconnection greatly simplifies the task of portable devices communicating with peripherals. In doing so, wireless connectivity allows

20 improved ergonomics in portable product design, flexibility in interconnection to one or more peripherals, freedom of